

REMARKS

Claims 166-185 are pending in the application. Claims 166-185 currently stand rejected. No claims are amended herein. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 166, 168-172, 176, and 178-182 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,687,241 (hereinafter “Goss”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 166 describes a method of routing a voice call, including a cookie, to a call center resource. Specifically, claim 166 recites, in part, receiving a voice call originating from the user device including the cookie, processing the cookie from the user device to select one of the call center resources, and routing the voice call originating from the user device to the selected one of the call center resources.

Goss fails to disclose or suggest *receiving a voice call originating from the user device including the cookie*. Rather, Goss discloses a Contact Server that enables customers to submit call-back requests to a call center via the Internet, or virtually any other communications technology available – including voice telephony over the Internet. (Goss, col. 1, lines 62-65). Regardless, in Goss, the call-back request does not include a cookie, as required by claim 1. In fact, Goss only discloses use of a cookie in conjunction with the preferred embodiment – call-back request via the Internet. Goss is silent with respect to use of a cookie with a customer that submits a call-back request using voice telephony over the Internet technology.

Nonetheless, even in the preferred embodiment, the disclosed cookie is provided by a Web Server and not the customer device, as required by claim 1. For example, the preferred embodiment discloses that the customer uses a PC equipped with a Web browser to access a Web site supported by a “Web Server [that] maintains a session with the customer’s browser 44, using cookies or other session maintenance methodology.” (Goss, col. 7, lines 51-64). Thus, in Goss, it is not the PC that provides a cookie to the Web Server but the Web Server that maintains the session using cookies that *it* provides to the PC via the Web site.

Moreover, because Goss fails to disclose receiving a voice call originating from the user device including the cookie, it follows that Goss also fails to disclose or suggest processing the *cookie from the user device* to select one of the call center resources.

Furthermore, Goss also fails to disclose or suggest *routing the voice call originating from the user device to the selected one of the call center resources*. Rather, as discussed above, Goss discloses a Contact Server that enables customers to submit call-back requests to a call center via voice telephony over the Internet. (Goss, col. 1, lines 62-65). However, Goss specifically provides that after the Contact Server receives the call-back request, the Contact Server determines if an agent is available and “the agent can *then place a telephone call* to the number provided by the customer who submitted the call-back request.” (Goss, col. 2, lines 2-7). If an agent is not available, the Contact Server can provide call-back services at a later time. (Goss, col. 2, lines 14-16). Thus, in Goss, it is clear that even if the call-back request is received from the user device using voice telephony over Internet technology, the same voice call (e.g., the originating voice call) is not routed to the selected one of the call center resources, as required by claim 1.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 166 is allowable in view of the cited reference, and such indication is respectfully requested. Independent claim 176 contains limitations similar to those of claim 166, and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 166.

While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick L. Muino/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Patrick L. Muino, Reg. No. 64,863

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: patrick@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe

Sprint

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100